

34. Growth-Inducing Impacts

34.1 Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of the potential growth-inducing impacts of the No Project/No Action Alternative and the three proposed Project action alternatives, Alternatives A, B, and C. To provide context for this assessment, this chapter also briefly describes population projections in the three study areas, which were presented in Chapter 22 Socioeconomics.

34.2 California Environmental Quality Act and National Environmental Policy Act Requirements

To comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), respectively, must discuss the ways in which the alternatives could result in indirect effects to the environment, including growth-inducing effects. This section briefly describes the CEQA and NEPA requirements related to growth-inducing impacts.

34.2.1 California Environmental Quality Act Requirements

CEQA requires that an EIR evaluate the growth-inducing impacts of a proposed project (California Public Resource Code Section 21100(b)(5)). The State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.2(d), state that an EIR should discuss the:

“Growth-Inducing Impact of the Proposed Project. Discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a wastewater treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also discuss the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.”

Consideration of growth-inducing impacts pursuant to CEQA has been further described in *Napa Citizens for Honest Government v. Napa County Board of Supervisors* (2001) (91 Cal.App.4th 342, 367-371[110 Cal.Rptr.2d 579]) in which the California Court of Appeal, Fourth District stated:

“Neither CEQA itself, nor the cases that have interpreted it, require an EIR to anticipate and mitigate the effects of a particular project on growth in other areas. In circumstances such as these, it is sufficient that the final EIR (FEIR) warns interested persons and governing bodies of the probability that additional housing will be needed so that they can take steps to prepare for or address that probability. The FEIR need not forecast the impact that the housing will have on as yet unidentified areas and propose measures to mitigate that impact.”

34.2.2 National Environmental Policy Act Requirements

The EISs prepared by the Department of the Interior (DOI) agencies, including Reclamation, are prepared using regulations implementing NEPA as prepared by DOI and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). The CEQ regulations require an EIS to consider indirect effects of a project, which are often related to growth-inducing effects (40 CFR 1508.8(b)), as described below:

“Indirect effects, which are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect effects may include growth-inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems.”

34.3 Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

This analysis includes an Extended Study Area, Secondary Study Area, and a Primary Study Area, as described in more detail below.

34.3.1 Extended Study Area

The Extended Study Area includes the entire service areas of the State Water Project (SWP) and Central Valley Project (CVP). These two service areas are located within all or portions of the following 39 counties: Alameda, Butte, Calaveras, Colusa, Contra Costa, El Dorado, Fresno, Glenn, Imperial, Kern, Kings, Los Angeles, Madera, Merced, Monterey, Napa, Nevada, Orange, Placer, Plumas, Riverside, Sacramento, San Benito, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Shasta, Solano, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Tulare, Tuolumne, Ventura, and Yolo. The proposed Project’s primary objective of improved water supply reliability has the potential for long-term direct and indirect effects within those two service areas. The Extended Study Area is shown on Figure 1-6 in Chapter 1 Introduction.

34.3.2 Secondary Study Area

The Secondary Study Area is defined as the area of potential Project-related operational effects, including SWP and CVP facilities that could experience reservoir water surface elevation fluctuations and stream flow changes downstream from their facilities. Those facilities are located within the following 22 counties: Alameda, Butte, Colusa, Contra Costa, Del Norte, El Dorado, Glenn, Humboldt, Marin, Placer, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Shasta, Solano, Sonoma, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Yolo, and Yuba.

The potential operational changes could occur as a result of the coordinated and integrated operation of the proposed Project facilities with State and federal projects located on the American River, Trinity River, Sacramento River, Clear Creek, Spring Creek, Feather River, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta). The Secondary Study Area is shown on Figure 1-8 in Chapter 1 Introduction.

34.3.3 Primary Study Area

The Primary Study Area is defined as the areas within Glenn and Colusa counties where short-term and long-term direct effects from constructing, operating, and/or maintaining proposed Project facilities may occur. This area includes the footprints of the proposed Sites Reservoir Inundation Area and the associated facilities (e.g., dams, bridge, regulating reservoirs, intakes/discharge facilities, pipelines,

electrical transmission line, electrical distribution lines, pumping/generating plants, recreation areas, and new and relocated roads). The Primary Study Area is shown on Figures 1-9A, 1-9B, and 1-9C in Chapter 1 Introduction for Alternatives A, B, and C.

34.4 Project Components Potentially Related to Growth

A project could result in growth-inducing impacts through several means, including the removal of obstacles to population growth, or actions that encourage and facilitate other activities beyond those proposed by the project. Growth-inducing impacts are generally related to actions that could increase economic or population growth, including the need for additional housing or community services, that could result in direct or indirect changes in the environment in addition to direct impacts related to implementation of that project.

Direct growth inducement would occur if a project directly results in new permanent employment opportunities or new permanent residents, which would increase long-term demands for public services and utilities or result in changes to land use and potentially effects on other environmental resources.

Indirect growth inducement could occur if a project eliminates an obstacle to population growth or land development that currently prevents achievement of adopted growth projections, such as increased water supply availability. Indirect growth inducement also could occur if a project results in improved economic activity that causes population growth in excess of adopted growth projections. Potential impacts related to growth projections in adopted land use plans and growth management policies (e.g., transportation management plans) generally are addressed by measures to avoid or mitigate direct and indirect impacts to the extent feasible.

For this EIR/EIS, growth inducement is primarily related to expected changes in water supply reliability and/or water quality for agricultural, municipal, and industrial water users, as described below.

- **Improve water supply reliability for agricultural, urban, and environmental uses.** One primary objective of the proposed Project is to improve water supply reliability. Water supply reliability requires the delivery of specified amounts of water at predictable locations and times. During prolonged drought periods, water supplies are less reliable, which increases competition and can lead to conflict among users. This can be exacerbated by a lack of surface water storage due to increased environmental requirements, and reduced natural rainfall for agriculture. The proposed Project is intended to help ease the pressure on a system that is already having difficulty serving California's water needs. By providing additional surface water storage capacity to capture early runoff, additional fresh water would be available to improve water supply reliability.
- **Improve water quality.** The Delta is the diversion point for drinking water for millions of Californians, and is critical to California's agricultural economy. The proposed Project could improve water quality with increased flows by releasing high quality stored water into the Sacramento River during periods when Delta water quality is impaired.
- **Provide more options for water management.** The existing State and federal water systems, SWP and CVP, are relatively rigid in terms of timing, location, and how water is pumped from the Delta. Urban, agricultural, and environmental water needs have each increased and have created conflicting demands for limited water supplies. Water management flexibility can create a more rapid response to meeting these demands, but also for unexpected incidents, such as Delta levee breaks. Strategically

located surface water storage would provide flexibility in the system for agricultural, environmental, and municipal and industrial users.

- **Increased recreational opportunities.** The proposed Project would include up to five new recreation areas. Collectively, recreation opportunities at the five recreation areas could provide: boating, camping, picnicking, fishing, swimming, and hiking. Depending on the recreation area, proposed facilities may include boat launch sites, trails, designated swimming and fishing access, picnic tables, shaded canopies, campfire rings/barbeques, vault toilets, and dumpsters.
- **Increased temporary and permanent employment opportunities.** The proposed Project would require part-time and full-time construction workers during its construction and operation. The proposed Project also would improve water supply reliability for agricultural water users in the Extended Study Area, which would increase agriculturally-related employment.

34.5 Environmental Impacts/Environmental Consequences

34.5.1 Regulatory Setting

The regulatory requirements pursuant to CEQA and NEPA are summarized in Section 34.2.

34.5.2 Evaluation Criteria and Significance Thresholds

The evaluation criteria used for this impact analysis represent thresholds that were used to identify whether an impact would be significant pursuant to CEQA. Although CEQA does not provide specific significance thresholds for Growth-Inducing Impacts, the proposed Project was evaluated based on the following general requirements of Section 15126.2(d) of CEQA and professional judgment that considered current regulations, standards, and knowledge of the area. For the purposes of this analysis, an alternative would result in a significant impact if it would result in any of the following:

- Growth that is not consistent with or accommodated by the land use plans and growth management plans and policies for the area affected.
- Secondary growth effects, including increased demand on community and public services and infrastructure, increased traffic and noise, and adverse environmental impacts, such as degradation of air and water quality and conversion of agricultural and open space land to developed uses.

Similar evaluation criteria were used for the environmental analysis pursuant to NEPA; however, levels of significance for impacts are not defined.

34.5.3 Impact Assessment Assumptions

This analysis necessarily takes a general approach to determining potential growth-inducing impacts of the proposed Project. The specific areas of delivery and end use of proposed Project water are unforeseeable and too speculative for site-specific analysis. Furthermore, the CEQA Guidelines do not require that an EIR predict (or speculate) specifically where such growth would occur, in what form it would occur, or when it would occur. The answers to such questions require speculation, which CEQA discourages (CEQA Guidelines Section 15145).

This impact assessment analyzes the effects of the proposed Project facilities listed above that could influence growth, including:

- Improved water supply reliability, water quality, and options for urban water supplies
- Additional recreational opportunities
- Increased temporary and permanent employment opportunities

34.5.3.1 Improved Water Supply Reliability, Water Quality, and Options for Urban Water Supplies

As described in Chapter 22 Socioeconomics, population projections have been developed for the Extended Study Area that would include urban areas that could use improved water supplies from the proposed Project. The causal link between improved water supply reliability (including conditions related to increased options for urban water supplies) and water quality and any increase in population or economic growth could be speculative because the specific location of users with improved water supply conditions and the quantitative incremental improvement is not known. Because this issue cannot be determined with certainty, for the purposes of this EIR/EIS, the assumption was made that improved water supply conditions could stimulate growth.

The potential to stimulate growth does not necessarily result in “growth-inducement” or secondary growth impacts that have not been provided for in existing land use, public works, utilities, and community services plans. The determination if the growth is to be considered “growth-inducing” has been analyzed with respect to the ability of existing water supplies to meet the demand of population projections in existing planning documents. Information provided to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) through submittals of Urban Water Management Plans was used to determine if urban water supplies have adequate water supplies to meet the water demands for 2030 population growth projections.

34.5.3.2 Improved Recreational Opportunities

As described in Chapter 21 Recreation Resources and Chapter 22 Socioeconomics, estimates for increased recreational use and recreational employment have been developed for the proposed Project alternatives, and compared to Existing Conditions and the No Project/No Action Alternative. The increased recreational use and employment could stimulate growth. As described above, the potential to stimulate growth does not necessarily result in “growth-inducement” or secondary growth impacts that have not been provided for in existing land use, public works, utilities, and community services plans. The increase in recreation use and employment are discussed in this chapter relative to existing community plans.

34.5.3.3 Increased Temporary and Permanent Employment Opportunities

As described in Chapter 22 Socioeconomics, estimates for increased temporary and permanent employment opportunities have been developed for the proposed Project alternatives, and compared to Existing Conditions and the No Project/No Action Alternative. The increased employment could stimulate growth. As described above, the potential to stimulate growth does not necessarily result in “growth-inducement” or secondary growth impacts that have not been provided for in existing land use, public works, utilities, and community services plans. The increase in employment is discussed in this chapter relative to existing community plans.

It should be noted that DWR, Reclamation, and/or water supply agencies that are not part of cities cannot make local decisions regarding the extent and location of growth. Cities and counties are responsible for considering the environmental effects of their growth and land use planning decisions with appropriate mitigation measures in accordance with CEQA.

34.5.4 Growth-Inducing Impacts Associated with the No Project/No Action Alternative

34.5.4.1 *Extended, Secondary, and Primary Study Areas – No Project/No Action Alternative*

The No Project/No Action Alternative includes implementation of projects and programs being constructed, or those that have gained approval, as of June 2009, as described in Chapter 3, Description of Proposed Project/Proposed Action and Alternatives and listed in Tables 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3. The impacts of the projects included in the No Project/No Action Alternative have already been evaluated on a project-by-project basis, pursuant to CEQA and/or NEPA, and their potential for growth-inducing impacts has been addressed in those environmental documents.

In addition, if the No Project/No Action Alternative is implemented, no facilities would be constructed pursuant to the proposed Project alternatives, resulting in no direct or indirect growth inducement within the three study areas related to those facilities.

Economic Growth Opportunities Related to Improved Water Supply Reliability, Water Quality, and Options for Urban Water Supplies

Changes in water supply reliability, water quality, and options for urban water supplies associated with implementation of the No Project/No Action Alternative would affect long-term average water deliveries and water deliveries. Historically, urban development depended upon the availability of long-term water supplies and would implement water conservation measures to maintain community services during Dry and Critical Dry years. In the future, water conservation measures would be included in long-term average water demand projections, and there would be fewer opportunities to reduce water demands without substantial effects to water users.

Expected water supply conditions with implementation of the No Project/No Action Alternative for urban water users within the Extended and Secondary study areas are difficult to define with specificity due to the wide range of water supplies, including surface water rights, groundwater resources, supplies from wastewater and stormwater reclamation, water transfers, water conservation, carryover storage in surface water reservoirs and groundwater aquifers, and ocean and brackish water desalination along the coastlines and in areas with brackish groundwater. Also, by 2020, the State has mandated the statewide reduction of urban water demand by 20 percent. Recently, more than 300 urban water agencies and private utilities submitted Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs) to DWR that provide a broad perspective on water supplies through 2030. The UWMPs consider water demands following the reduction in statewide urban water demand by 2020, implementation of future water supplies, and the ability of water supplies to meet water demands in Normal, Single-Dry, and Multiple-Dry water years.

Many water supply agencies have indicated in their UWMPs that long-term average water supplies in Year 2030 would be managed at a level greater than long-term water demands, including storage of water during wetter years to be used during drier years. Overall, comparison of the long-term water supplies to the long-term water demands can be used to evaluate the potential for economic growth and for removal of obstacles to growth. The UWMPs include continuing implementation of existing water supply facilities

and facilities that were under construction during preparation of this EIR/EIS, including water supply projects listed in Tables 3-1 and 3-2.

Information from representative UWMPs submitted to DWR by communities that could use water supplied through SWP or CVP conveyance facilities are summarized in Table 34-1. This table summarizes information presented in UWMPs submitted to DWR between 2010 and 2013 related to projected population, urban water use or demand in Normal water years, and urban water supplies in Normal water years. The values for urban water use in 2030 include assumptions related to the statewide 20 percent reduction in urban water use by 2020.

**Table 34-1
Projected Population, Water Use, and Long-Term Water Supplies in Normal Water Years^a for Major Communities in Water Delivery Regions that Use SWP and CVP Water Supplies**

	Sacramento Valley^b	San Joaquin Valley^c	San Francisco Bay Area^d	Central Coast^e	Southern California^f	TOTAL
2010 Population	1,036,000	734,000	4,911,000	292,000	21,568,000	28,541,000
2030 Population	1,424,000	1,106,000	5,920,000	335,000	26,054,000	34,839,000
2010 Urban Water Use (Demand) in a "Normal" Water Year (af/yr)	359,000	374,000	1,088,000	29,000	4,689,000	6,539,000
2030 Urban Water Use (Demand) in a "Normal" Water Year (af/yr and % increase from 2010)	591,000 (64%)	390,000 (4%)	1,288,000 (18%)	28,000 (0)	5,306,000 (13%)	7,603,000 (16%)
2010 Urban Water Supplies in a "Normal" Water Year (af/yr)	690,000	383,000	1,304,000	43,000	5,496,000	7,916,000
2030 Urban Water Supplies in a "Normal" Water Year (af/yr and % increase from 2010)	852,000 (24%)	468,000 (22%)	1,386,000 (6%)	43,000 (0)	5,882,000 (7%)	8,631,000 (9%)

^aNormal water years are defined as long-term average water year values, pursuant to the DWR "Guidebook to Assist Urban Water Suppliers to Prepare a 2010 Urban Water Management Plan."

^bIncludes information from 2010 Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs) for El Dorado Irrigation District, Folsom, Placer County Water Agency, Roseville, Sacramento County Water Agency, Sacramento Suburban Water District, San Juan Water District, West Sacramento, and Yuba City.

^cIncludes information from 2010 UWMPs for Fresno, Stockton, and Tracy.

^dIncludes information from 2010 UWMPs for Alameda County Water District, Contra Costa Water District, East Bay Municipal Utility District, Hollister, Napa, Santa Clara Valley Water District, Solano County Water Agency, and Zone 7 Water Agency.

^eIncludes information from 2010 UWMP for Central Coast Water Authority.

^fIncludes information from 2010 UWMPs for Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency, Coachella Valley Water District, Crestline-Lake Arrowhead Water Agency, Desert Water Agency, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Mojave Water Agency, Palmdale Water District, San Bernardino Valley, San Geronimo Pass Water Agency, and Santa Clarita Valley (Castaic Lake Water Agency et al).

Notes:

af/yr = acre feet per year

CVP = Central Valley Project

SWP = State Water Project

Sources: ACWD, 2011; AVEK, 2011; CCWA, 2011; CCWD, 2011; CLAWA, 2011; CLWA et al., 2011; CVWD, 2011; DWA, 2011; EBMUD, 2011; EID, 2011; Folsom, 2011; Fresno, 2012; Hollister, 2011; Metropolitan, 2010; MWA, 2011; Napa, 2011; PCWA, 2011; PWD, 2011; Roseville, 2011; SBVWD et al., 2011; SCVWD, 2011; SCWA, 2011; SGPWA, 2010; SJWD, 2011; Solano CWA, 2011; SSWD, 2011; Stockton, 2011; Tracy, 2011; West Sacramento, 2011; Yuba City, 2011; and Zone 7, 2010.

The values in Table 34-1 indicate that, in Normal water years, water supplies are generally greater than urban water demand. The portion of water supplies not used in Normal or Wet years generally is directly or indirectly stored in surface water storage reservoirs or groundwater aquifers for use in drier years.

PRELIMINARY – SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Information in the UWMPs indicates that water supplies can be substantially reduced in drier years, which require implementation of strict water conservation to continue to meet the water demands. Information from the UWMPs is used by land use planning agencies to determine if adequate water supplies exist for future population projections and land use development. The UWMPs generally indicate that existing and projected water supplies for the No Project/No Action Alternative are adequate for population projections in existing land use plans. The No Project/No Action Alternative includes facilities that were approved for construction or under construction during preparation of this EIR/EIS. The effects of implementation of those facilities are already included in adopted planning documents and UWMPs.

In summary, implementation of planned projects included in the No Project/No Action Alternative is not anticipated to result in growth-inducing effects in addition to those discussed in adopted general plans and associated environmental documentation in the Extended, Secondary, or Primary study areas because the water supply agencies are already planning on implementation of the facilities included in the No Project/No Action Alternative, including those related to improved water supply reliability, water quality, and options for urban water supplies.

Economic Growth Opportunities Related to Improved Recreational Opportunities

The No Project/No Action Alternative includes future projects that would either maintain or improve existing recreational opportunities within the Extended and Secondary study areas due to projected facilities. Additional recreational opportunities could occur due to increased fishing opportunities in the Sacramento Valley due to implementation of the projects included in the No Project/No Action Alternative. Most of the projects included in the No Project/No Action Alternative do not include specific facilities to improve recreational opportunities. The Oroville FERC License Renewal, Los Vaqueros Reservoir Expansion, Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area Land Management Plan, San Joaquin River Restoration, Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan, and North American Waterfowl Management Plan include actions that could improve recreational opportunities.

As described in Chapter 22 Socioeconomics, it is anticipated that, if the No Project/Action Alternative is implemented, recreation expenditure patterns in the Extended and Secondary study areas would be similar to those described for Existing Conditions. Growth in population is expected to cause growth in recreation economic activity. **Therefore, expected increased recreational opportunities in the Extended and Secondary study areas associated with implementation of the No Project/No Action Alternative are not anticipated to result in growth-inducing impacts not previously addressed in existing environmental documentation for adopted general plans.**

As described in Chapter 21, Recreation Resources, none of the projects and programs included in the No Project/No Action Alternative are or would be located within the Primary Study Area, or would directly or indirectly affect existing recreation opportunities in the Primary Study Area.

Economic Growth Opportunities Related to Increased Temporary and Permanent Employment

As described in Chapter 22 Socioeconomics, the No Project/No Action Alternative includes implementation of projects and programs being constructed, or those that have gained approval, as of June 2009. **The impacts of these projects have already been evaluated on a project by project basis, pursuant to CEQA and/or NEPA, and their potential to exceed established standards has been addressed in those environmental documents (e.g., the Oroville FERC License Renewal and Los**

Vaqueros Reservoir Expansion); therefore, these projects are not anticipated to result in growth-inducing impacts.

34.5.5 Growth-Inducing Impacts Associated with Alternative A

34.5.5.1 Extended, Secondary, and Primary Study Areas – Alternative A

Implementation of Alternative A is expected to improve water supply reliability, increase water supply, improve water quality and provide water management flexibility in the Extended, Secondary, and Primary study areas. Alternative A is also expected to provide increased employment and recreational opportunities. The potential of Alternative A to induce growth is discussed below.

Economic Growth Opportunities Related to Improved Water Supply Reliability, Water Quality, and Options for Urban Water Supplies

Improved water supply reliability, water quality, and options for urban water supplies would affect long-term average water deliveries and water deliveries in Dry and Critical water years. Historically, urban development depended upon the availability of long-term water supplies, and urban users would implement water conservation measures to maintain community services during Dry and Critical Dry years. In the future, water conservation measures would be included in long-term average water demand projections, and there would be fewer opportunities to reduce water demands without substantial effects to water users. Therefore, many water supply agencies have indicated in their UWMPs that long-term average water supplies would be managed at a level greater than long-term water demands to allow for storage of water to be used during Dry and Critical Dry years. Overall, comparison of the long-term water supplies to the long-term water demands can be used to evaluate the potential for economic growth and for removal of obstacles to growth.

With implementation of Alternative A, long-term average CVP water deliveries to municipal and industrial (M&I) water users (primarily located in urban communities) in the Sacramento Valley and San Francisco Bay Area could increase by 29 to 151 percent, when compared to Existing Conditions (refer to Table 6-118¹). However, that increase in water deliveries could occur with implementation of the No Project/No Action Alternative (refer to Table 6-37) and not be related to implementation of Alternative A. With Alternative A, M&I water deliveries for the CVP could increase zero to one percent, when compared to the No Project/No Action Alternative (refer to Table 6-119).

With Alternative A, long-term average SWP water deliveries to M&I water users in the Sacramento Valley, San Francisco Bay Area, San Joaquin Valley, Central Coast, and Southern California could increase by one to nine percent, when compared to Existing Conditions (refer to Table 6-120). A portion of that increase could occur with implementation of the No Project/No Action Alternative (refer to Table 6-38) and not be related to implementation of Alternative A. With implementation of Alternative A, M&I water deliveries for the SWP could increase five to six percent, when compared to the No Project/No Action Alternative (refer to Table 6-121).

Similar increases in Dry and Critical Dry water year deliveries are projected with implementation of Alternative A, when compared to the No Project/No Action Alternative, as described in Chapter 6 Surface Water Resources.

¹ All tables "6-XX" refer to tables in Chapter 6 Surface Water Resources.

Changes in long-term average water deliveries of one to six percent with implementation of Alternative A, when compared to the No Project/No Action Alternative, are similar or substantially less than the anticipated increase of 6 to 39 percent in long-term average water supplies for major urban water users in the Sacramento Valley, San Francisco Bay Area, San Joaquin Valley, Central Coast, and Southern California (refer to Table 34-1). As discussed in Chapter 22 Socioeconomics, implementation of Alternative A could be used to avoid the implementation of other more expensive water supplies that are included in the future assumptions for the UWMPs.

Reduced M&I water supply costs does not necessarily imply a rise in local economic activity. If the cost savings are spent on other goods and services within the local or regional economy, economic growth could be increased. However, if most of the savings are spent outside the local or regional economy, the benefits may not be realized. Because the cost savings could be small relative to the urban economy, and the spending patterns are uncertain, the economic benefits that could occur with implementation of Alternative A would result in a minor growth effect.

Increased water deliveries to agricultural water users in the Extended Study Area are not expected to be growth inducing, and could reduce the potential to change adopted land use plans that would allow conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses. This is because increased agricultural water deliveries, expected with implementation of Alternative A, could range from zero to three percent, when compared to Existing Conditions, and zero to five percent, when compared to the No Project/No Action Alternative (refer to Tables 6-118 through 6-121). Although the expected increased water supply deliveries could result in increased employment and other economic benefits, the effects on housing and population are expected to be minor in the Extended Study Area, when compared to the total housing and population (refer to Chapter 22 Socioeconomics).

In summary, expected improved water supply reliability, water quality, and options for urban water supplies associated with implementation of Alternative A are not anticipated to result in growth-inducing effects through improved economic growth in the Extended, Secondary, or Primary study areas.

Economic Growth Opportunities Related to Improved Recreational Opportunities

Implementation of Alternative A is expected to provide additional recreational opportunities within the Primary Study Area. Total recreation visitation is anticipated to increase by more than 358,000 annual visits, increasing non-local recreation expenditures to approximately \$2.9 million (refer to Table 22-36²). **Expected increased recreation expenditures associated with implementation of Alternative A would represent less than 0.2 percent of total industrial expenditures in the Primary Study Area and are not anticipated to increase growth within the entire Primary Study Area.**

Increased recreational visits could result in additional demands for public services and utilities, including the use of roadways and utilities. As described in Chapter 26 Navigation, Transportation, and Traffic, the expected increase in recreational visits would not increase traffic in excess of existing acceptable levels of service of existing roadways, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Table 26-20). Alternative A would not be expected to result in the need to expand roadways which could also support future growth, as described in Chapter 26 Navigation, Transportation, and Traffic. Increased demands on public services and utilities with implementation of Alternative A also would not be expected to result in

² All tables "22-XX" refer to tables in Chapter 22 Socioeconomics.

the need for expanded infrastructure which could also support future growth, as described in Chapter 29 Public Services and Utilities. However, increased recreation use could adversely affect public services due to increased traffic. The expected increase in traffic would result in a less-than-significant impact with implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Table 29-9). **Therefore, the expected increased recreational opportunities in the Primary Study Area associated with implementation of Alternative A are not anticipated to result in growth-inducing impacts.**

Economic Growth Opportunities Related to Increased Temporary and Permanent Employment

Implementation of Alternative A could result in an increase of 72 jobs in the agricultural sector in the Extended Study Area due to the expected increased water supply reliability (refer to Table 22-26). **The expected magnitude of the impacts would be less than one percent, when compared to the regional economy of the Extended Study Area, and is not anticipated to result in growth-inducing impacts.**

Implementation of Alternative A is expected to provide additional employment opportunities in the Primary Study Area for both construction and operation/maintenance of the proposed Project facilities. Implementation of Alternative A could result in 581 additional temporary jobs (primarily due to construction of the proposed facilities pursuant to Alternative A) and 59 additional permanent jobs (primarily for the proposed water supply facilities operation and recreational facilities), when compared to the No Project/No Action Alternative (refer to Tables 22-33 and 22-34). The majority of the temporary jobs would be associated with construction. It is anticipated that most of the construction jobs would be filled from within the Primary Study Area. However, construction may require specialized worker skills not readily available in the local labor pool. As a result, it is anticipated that some of the non-local workers would travel from outside the two-county Primary Study Area. Considering the multi-year duration of construction, it is anticipated that 20 percent of the imported workers would relocate to the two-county region, adding to the local population. It is anticipated that all of the workers required for operation would relocate to the two-county region. This additional population from construction and operation would constitute a minor increase in the total 2020 projected regional population of 64,605 and would not pose a burden on local public services, utilities, or infrastructure. In addition, these jobs would represent less than a one percent increase in the total labor force in the Primary Study Area, as described in Chapter 22 Socioeconomics.

Most of the construction and operation workforce would most likely commute daily to the proposed Project site from within the two-county region; however, if needed, there are approximately 2,000 available housing units to accommodate workers who may choose to commute to the proposed Project site on a workweek basis or who may choose to relocate to the region, as described in Chapter 22 Socioeconomics. In addition to the available housing units, there are recreational vehicle parks within the two-county region to accommodate construction workers. As a result, construction and operation of the proposed Project is not expected to increase the demand for housing within the two-county region. Within specific local communities, there could be localized effects on housing during proposed Project construction. However, given the availability of housing within the two-county region, predicting where this impact may occur would be highly speculative.

As described above and Chapter 22 Socioeconomics, construction and operation of Alternative A would be expected to result in a minor increase in jobs and population in the Primary Study Area which could be accommodated within available housing units. **An adequate housing supply exists to accommodate the**

change in population, and as such, this expected increase associated with implementation of Alternative A is not anticipated to be growth inducing.

Removing Obstacles to Growth

A variety of factors indirectly influence business, residential, and population growth in a region. Among these are General Plans and policies, and the availability of public utility services, public schools, and transportation services. Water is one of the primary public services needed to support urban development, including businesses, industry (including agriculture), and housing. If a deficiency in water service capacity constrains future development, then improving water supply reliability and increasing water supply would remove a physical impediment to planned development and result in growth-inducing impacts.

However, as described above, the expected increase in water yield associated with implementation of Alternative A would be within the range of projected increases of water supplies by major urban water users in their recent UWMPs to provide adequate water supplies for planned growth. The expected additional water deliveries associated with implementation of Alternative A to urban water users probably could be considered as replacement water supplies instead of implementing other projects identified in the UWMPs. A portion of the expected improved water supply reliability also could be used for agricultural water supplies or to improve environmental conditions in specific streams. However, because the UWMPs have identified adequate water supplies to meet future water demands in 2030 for the Long-Term average and Dry and Critical Dry year conditions, it does not appear that growth is currently being adversely affected due to lack of water supplies in these major urban communities.

Implementation of Alternative A is not anticipated to result in the removal of obstacles to growth, and therefore, is not anticipated to result in growth-inducing impacts.

It should be noted that DWR, Reclamation, and/or water supply agencies that are not part of cities cannot make local decisions regarding the extent and location of growth. Cities and counties that could receive water from the proposed Project are responsible for considering the environmental effects of their growth and land use planning decisions. When new developments are proposed, the cities and counties must prepare environmental documents pursuant to CEQA; and where appropriate, these agencies must consider mitigation measures to reduce adverse impacts of the growth and/or overriding considerations.

34.5.6 Growth-Inducing Impacts Associated with Alternative B

34.5.6.1 Extended, Secondary, and Primary Study Areas – Alternative B

Similar to Alternative A, implementation of Alternative B would be expected to improve water supply reliability, increase water supply, improve water quality, and provide water management flexibility in the Extended, Secondary, and Primary study areas. Implementation of Alternative B would also be expected to provide increased employment and recreational opportunities. The potential of Alternative B to induce growth is discussed below.

Economic Growth Opportunities Related to Improved Water Supply Reliability, Water Quality, and Options for Urban Water Supplies

The expected long-term average CVP water deliveries to M&I water users in the Sacramento Valley and San Francisco Bay Area associated with implementation of Alternative B would be similar to those described for Alternative A. The expected increase would be from 29 to 149 percent, when compared to

Existing Conditions, rather than the 29 to 151 percent increase associated with Alternative A. This increase in water deliveries could occur with implementation of the No Project/No Action Alternative and not be related to implementation of Alternative B. With Alternative B implementation, expected M&I water deliveries for the CVP would be similar to water deliveries described for the No Project/No Action Alternative and Alternative A.

With Alternative B implementation, long-term average SWP water deliveries to M&I water users in the Sacramento Valley, San Francisco Bay Area, San Joaquin Valley, Central Coast, and Southern California could increase by one to nine percent, when compared to Existing Conditions (i.e., the same as described for Alternative A). A portion of that increase could occur with implementation of the No Project/No Action Alternative and not be related to implementation of Alternative B. With implementation of Alternative B, M&I water deliveries for the SWP could increase five to six percent (the same as for Alternative A), when compared to the No Project/No Action Alternative.

Similar increases in Dry and Critical Dry water year deliveries are projected with implementation of Alternative B, when compared to expected increases with implementation of the No Project/No Action Alternative and Alternative A.

Expected changes in long-term average water deliveries of one to six percent with implementation of Alternative B, when compared to the No Project/No Action Alternative, are similar or substantially less than the anticipated increase of 6 to 39 percent in long-term average water supplies for major urban water users in the Sacramento Valley, San Francisco Bay Area, San Joaquin Valley, Central Coast, and Southern California. This change is the same as was described for Alternative A.

Similar to that described for Alternative A, because the water supply cost savings could be small relative to the urban economy and the spending patterns are uncertain, the economic benefits that could occur with Alternative B implementation would be expected to result in a minor growth effect.

Expected increased agricultural water deliveries associated with implementation of Alternative B could range from zero to one percent (whereas it would be expected to range from zero to three percent with Alternative A implementation), when compared to Existing Conditions, and zero to six percent (whereas it would be expected to range from zero to five percent with Alternative A implementation), when compared to the No Project/No Action Alternative. Similar to that described for Alternative A, although the increased water supply deliveries could result in increased employment and other economic benefits, the effects on housing and population are expected to be minor in the Extended Study Area, when compared to the total housing and population.

In summary, similar to that described for Alternative A, expected improved water supply reliability, water quality, and options for urban water supplies associated with implementation of Alternative B is not anticipated to result in growth-inducing effects through improved economic growth in the Extended, Secondary, or Primary study areas.

Economic Growth Opportunities Related to Improved Recreational Opportunities

Similar to that described for Alternative A, Alternative B would be expected to provide additional recreational opportunities within the Primary Study Area, i.e., recreation visitation is anticipated to increase by more than 355,000 annual visits with Alternative B implementation, and 358,000 visits with Alternative A implementation, increasing non-local recreation expenditures to approximately \$2.9 million. **Similar to Alternative A, the expected increased recreation expenditures associated**

with implementation of Alternative B would represent less than 0.2 percent of total industrial expenditures in the Primary Study Area and are not anticipated to increase growth within the entire Primary Study Area.

Similar to that described for Alternative A, increased recreational visits could result in additional demands for public services and utilities, including the use of roadways and utilities. The expected increase in recreational visits would not increase traffic in excess of existing acceptable levels of service of existing roadways, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Table 26-20), and Alternative B implementation would not be expected to result in the need to expand roadways which could also support future growth, as described in Chapter 26 Navigation, Transportation, and Traffic. Expected increased demands on public services and utilities associated with implementation of Alternative B would also not be expected to result in the need for expanded infrastructure which could also support future growth, as described in Chapter 29 Public Services and Utilities. However, increased recreation use could adversely affect public services due to expected increased traffic. The expected increase in traffic would result in less than significant impacts with implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Table 29-9). **Therefore, similar to that described for Alternative A, the expected increased recreational opportunities in the Primary Study Area associated with implementation of Alternative B are not anticipated to result in growth-inducing impacts.**

Economic Growth Opportunities Related to Increased Temporary and Permanent Employment

Implementation of Alternative B could result in an increase of 60 jobs in the in the agricultural sector of the Extended Study Area due to the expected increased water supply reliability, whereas, Alternative A implementation could result in an increase of 72 jobs. **Similar to that described for Alternative A, the expected magnitude of the impacts associated with implementation of Alternative B would be less than one percent, when compared to the regional economy of the Extended Study Area, and is not anticipated to result in growth-inducing impacts.**

Implementation of Alternative B could result in 587 additional temporary jobs (primarily due to construction of the proposed facilities pursuant to Alternative B) and 53 additional permanent jobs (primarily for the proposed water supply facilities operation and recreational facilities), when compared to the No Project/No Action Alternative. In comparison, implementation of Alternative A could result in 581, 59, and 23 additional jobs, respectively. Similar to that described for Alternative A, the expected additional population from construction and operation would constitute a minor increase in the total 2020 projected regional population and would not pose a burden on local public services, utilities, or infrastructure. In addition, similar to that described for Alternative A, these jobs would represent less than a one percent increase in the total labor force in the Primary Study Area.

Construction and operation of the proposed Project is not expected to increase the demand for housing within the two-county region. Similar to that described for Alternative A, within specific local communities, there could be localized effects on housing during construction. However, given the availability of housing within the two-county region, predicting where this impact may occur would be highly speculative.

Similar to Alternative A, construction and operation of Alternative B would be expected to result in a minor increase in jobs and population in the Primary Study Area which could be accommodated within available housing units. **An adequate housing supply exists to accommodate the change in population**

and as such, this expected increase associated with implementation of Alternative B is not anticipated to be growth-inducing.

Removing Obstacles to Growth

Similar to that described for Alternative A, the expected increase in water yield with implementation of Alternative B would be within the range of projected increases of water supplies by major urban water users in their recent UWMPs to provide adequate water supplies for planned growth, and additional water deliveries associated with Alternative B implementation to urban water users probably could be considered as replacement water supplies instead of implementing other projects identified in the UWMPs. A portion of the expected improved water supply reliability also could be used for agricultural water supplies or to improve environmental conditions in specific streams. Because the UWMPs have identified adequate water supplies to meet future water demands in 2030 for the Long-Term average and Dry and Critical Dry year conditions, it does not appear that growth is being adversely affected due to lack of water supplies in these major urban communities. **Implementation of Alternative B is not anticipated to result in the removal of obstacles to growth, and therefore, is not anticipated to result in growth-inducing impacts.**

As indicated for Alternative A, DWR, Reclamation, and/or water supply agencies that are not part of cities cannot make local decisions regarding the extent and location of growth. Cities and counties that could receive water from the proposed Project are responsible for considering the environmental effects of their growth and land use planning decisions. When new developments are proposed, the cities and counties must prepare environmental documents pursuant to CEQA; and where appropriate, these agencies must consider mitigation measures to reduce adverse impacts of the growth and/or overriding considerations.

34.5.7 Growth-Inducing Impacts Associated with Alternative C

34.5.7.1 Extended, Secondary, and Primary Study Areas – Alternative C

Similar to that described for Alternative A, implementation of Alternative C would be expected to improve water supply reliability, increase water supply, improve water quality, and provide water management flexibility in the Extended, Secondary, and Primary study areas. Alternative C implementation would also be expected to provide increased employment and recreational opportunities. The potential of Alternative C to induce growth is discussed below.

Economic Growth Opportunities Related to Improved Water Supply Reliability, Water Quality, and Options for Urban Water Supplies

With implementation of Alternative C, long-term average CVP water deliveries to M&I water users (primarily located in urban communities) in the Sacramento Valley and San Francisco Bay Area could increase by 29 to 151 percent, when compared to Existing Conditions (i.e., the same as described for Alternative A). That increase in water deliveries could occur with implementation of the No Project/No Action Alternative and not be related to implementation of Alternative C. With Alternative C implementation, expected M&I water deliveries for the CVP would be similar to water deliveries described for the No Project/No Action Alternative and Alternative A.

With Alternative C implementation, long-term average SWP water deliveries to M&I water users in the Sacramento Valley, San Francisco Bay Area, San Joaquin Valley, Central Coast, and Southern California

could increase by 1 to 10 percent, when compared to Existing Conditions, whereas Alternative A implementation could result in a one to nine percent increase. A portion of that increase could occur with implementation of the No Project/No Action Alternative and not be related to implementation of Alternative C. With implementation of Alternative C, M&I water deliveries for the SWP could increase five to seven percent, when compared to the No Project/No Action Alternative, whereas Alternative A implementation could result in a five to six percent increase.

Similar increases in Dry and Critical Dry water year deliveries are projected with implementation of Alternative C, when compared to the No Project/No Action Alternative and Alternative A.

Expected changes in long-term average water deliveries of one to six percent with implementation of Alternative C, when compared to the No Project/No Action Alternative, are similar or substantially less than the anticipated increase of 6 to 39 percent in long-term average water supplies for major urban water users in the Sacramento Valley, San Francisco Bay Area, San Joaquin Valley, Central Coast, and Southern California. This is the same as was described for Alternative A.

Similar to that described for Alternative A, because the water supply cost savings could be small relative to the urban economy and the spending patterns are uncertain, the economic benefits that could occur with implementation of Alternative C would be expected to result in a minor growth effect.

Expected increased agricultural water deliveries associated with implementation of Alternative C could range from zero to two percent (whereas it could range from zero to three percent with Alternative A implementation), when compared to Existing Conditions, and zero to five percent (i.e., the same as described for Alternative A), when compared to the No Project/No Action Alternative. Similar to that described for Alternative A, although the increased water supply deliveries could result in increased employment and other economic benefits, the effects on housing and population are expected to be minor in the Extended Study Area, when compared to the total housing and population.

In summary, similar to that described for Alternative A, expected improved water supply reliability, water quality, and options for urban water supplies associated with implementation of Alternative C is not anticipated to result in growth-inducing effects through improved economic growth in the Extended, Secondary, or Primary study areas.

Economic Growth Opportunities Related to Improved Recreational Opportunities

Similar to that described for Alternative A, implementation of Alternative C would be expected to provide additional recreational opportunities within the Primary Study Area, i.e., recreation visitation is anticipated to increase by more than 370,000 annual visits with Alternative C implementation, and 358,000 visits with Alternative A implementation, increasing non-local recreation expenditures by between approximately \$2.9 million and approximately \$3.0 million. **Similar to that described for Alternative A, the expected increased recreation expenditures associated with implementation of Alternative C would represent less than 0.2 percent of total industrial expenditures in the Primary Study Area and are not anticipated to increase growth within the entire Primary Study Area.**

Similar to that described for Alternative A, expected increased recreational visits associated with implementation of Alternative C could result in additional demands for public services and utilities, including the use of roadways and utilities. The expected increase in recreational visits would not increase traffic in excess of existing acceptable levels of service of existing roadways, with the implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Table 26-20), and Alternative C implementation would not be expected to

result in the need to expand roadways which could also support future growth, as described in Chapter 26 Navigation, Transportation, and Traffic. Increased demands on public services and utilities with implementation of Alternative C would also not be expected to result in the need for expanded infrastructure which could also support future growth, as described in Chapter 29 Public Services and Utilities. However, increased recreation use could adversely affect public services due to increased traffic. The expected increase in traffic would result in less than significant impacts with implementation of mitigation measures (refer to Table 29-9). **Therefore, similar to that described for Alternative A, the expected increased recreational opportunities in the Primary Study Area associated with implementation of Alternative C are not anticipated to result in growth-inducing impacts.**

Economic Growth Opportunities Related to Increased Temporary and Permanent Employment

Implementation of Alternative C could result in an increase of 77 jobs in the agricultural sector in the Extended Study Area due to increased water supply reliability, whereas, Alternative A could result in an increase of 72 jobs. **Similar to that described for Alternative A, the expected magnitude of the impacts associated with implementation of Alternative C would be less than one percent, when compared to the regional economy of the Extended Study Area, and is not anticipated to result in growth-inducing impacts.**

Implementation of Alternative C could result in 648 additional temporary jobs (primarily due to construction of the proposed facilities pursuant to Alternative C) and 60 additional permanent jobs (primarily for the proposed water supply facilities operation and recreational facilities), when compared to the No Project/No Action Alternative. In comparison, implementation of Alternative A could result in 581, 59, and 23 additional jobs, respectively. Similar to that described for Alternative A, the expected additional population from construction and operation would constitute a minor increase in the total 2020 projected regional population and would not pose a burden on local public services, utilities, or infrastructure. In addition, similar to that described for Alternative A, these jobs would represent less than a one percent increase in the total labor force in the Primary Study Area. Construction and operation of the proposed Project is not expected to increase the demand for housing within the two-county region. Similar to that described for Alternative A, within specific local communities, there could be localized effects on housing during construction. However, given the availability of housing within the two-county region, predicting where this impact may occur would be highly speculative.

Similar to that described for Alternative A, construction and operation associated with implementation of Alternative C would be expected to result in a minor increase in jobs and population in the Primary Study Area which could be accommodated within available housing units. **An adequate housing supply exists to accommodate the change in population and as such, this expected increase associated with implementation of Alternative C is not anticipated to be growth-inducing.**

Removing Obstacles to Growth

Similar to that described for Alternative A, the expected increase in water yield associated with implementation of Alternative C would be within the range of projected increases of water supplies by major urban water users in their recent UWMPs to provide adequate water supplies for planned growth, and additional water deliveries associated with Alternative C implementation to urban water users probably could be considered as replacement water supplies instead of implementing other projects identified in the UWMPs. A portion of the expected improved water supply reliability also could be used

for agricultural water supplies or to improve environmental conditions in specific streams. Because the UWMPs have identified adequate water supplies to meet future water demands in 2030 for the Long-Term average and Dry and Critical Dry year conditions, it does not appear that growth is being adversely affected due to lack of water supplies in these major urban communities. **Implementation of Alternative C is not anticipated to result in the removal of obstacles to growth, and therefore, is not anticipated to result in growth-inducing impacts.**

As indicated for Alternative A, DWR, Reclamation, and/or water supply agencies that are not part of cities cannot make local decisions regarding the extent and location of growth. Cities and counties that could receive water from the proposed Project are responsible for considering the environmental effects of their growth and land use planning decisions. When new developments are proposed, the cities and counties must prepare environmental documents pursuant to CEQA; and where appropriate, these agencies must consider mitigation measures to reduce adverse impacts of the growth and/or overriding considerations.

34.6 Mitigation Measures

Because no significant or potentially significant impacts were identified, no mitigation is required or recommended.

34.7 References

- Alameda County Water District (ACWD). 2011. *Urban Water Management Plan 2010-2015*. June.
- Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency (AVEK). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. June.
- Castaic Lake Water Agency, Santa Clarita Water Division, Newhall County Water District, and Valencia Water Company (CLWA et al). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. June.
- Central Coast Water Authority (CCWA). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. June.
- City of Folsom (Folsom). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. June.
- City of Fresno (Fresno). 2012. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. November.
- City of Hollister (Hollister). 2011. *Draft 2010 Hollister Urban Area Urban Water Management Plan*. June.
- City of Napa (Napa). 2011. *Urban Water Management Plan 2010 Update*. June.
- City of Roseville (Roseville). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. August.
- City of Stockton (Stockton). 2011. *2010 City of Stockton Urban Water Management Plan*. May.
- City of Tracy (Tracy). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. 2011. May.
- City of West Sacramento (West Sacramento). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. 2011. October.
- City of Yuba City (Yuba City). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. June.
- Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan, Final Report*. July.

- Contra Costa Water District (CCWD). 2011. *Urban Water Management Plan*. June.
- Crestline-Lake Arrowhead Water Agency (CLAWA). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. August.
- Desert Water Agency (DWA). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. March.
- East Bay Municipal Utilities District (EBMUD). 2011. *Urban Water Management Plan 2010*. June.
- El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). 2011. *Urban Water Management Plan 2010 Update*. July.
- Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan). 2010. *The Regional Urban Water Management Plan*. November.
- Mojave Water Agency (MWA). 2011. *Final 2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. June.
- Palmdale Water District (PWD). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. June.
- Placer County Water Agency (PCWA). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. June.
- Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA). 2011. *2010 Zone 41 Urban Water Management Plan*. July.
- Sacramento Suburban Water District (SSWD). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. July.
- San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, East Valley Water District, City of Loma Linda, City of Redlands, City of San Bernardino Municipal Water Department, West Valley Water District, Yucaipa Valley Water District, and City of Colton (SBVMWD et al.). 2011. *2010 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan*. June.
- San Geronio Pass Water Agency (SGPWA). 2010. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan for the San Geronio Pass Water Agency*. December.
- San Juan Water District (SJWD). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. June.
- Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD). 2011. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. May.
- Solano County Water Agency (Solano CWA). 2011. *2010 Solano County Water Agency Urban Water Management Plan – Final Draft*. December.
- Zone 7 Water Agency (Zone 7). 2010. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. December.